APPEAL NO. 010142

This appeal arises pursuant to the Texas Workers' Compensation Act, TEX. LAB. CODE ANN. § 401.001 *et seq.* (1989 Act). Following a contested case hearing held on December 13, 2000, the hearing officer determined that the appellant (claimant) sustained an injury in the course and scope of his employment on ______; that he did not timely report the injury and did not have good cause for his untimely reporting; and that because his injury is not compensable, he did not have disability. The claimant has requested review of the good cause and disability determinations. The respondent (carrier) urges in reply that the evidence is sufficient to support the challenged determinations. The claimant, who, apparently, has a new address, also filed a request for a personal hearing in order to "present material concerning this matter." This document was not timely filed as an appeal.

DECISION

Affirmed.

Section 409.001 provides, in part, that an employee shall notify the employer of an injury not later than the 30th day after the date on which the injury occurs and Section 409.002 provides in part that failure to notify an employer as required by Section 409.001(a) relieves the employer and the employer's insurance carrier of liability unless the Texas Workers' Compensation Commission determines that good cause exists for failure to provide notice in a timely manner. The Appeals Panel has held that fear of job loss does not compel a finding of good cause. See, e.g., Texas Workers' Compensation Commission Appeal No. 94220, decided April 7, 1994; Texas Workers' Compensation Commission Appeal No. 941312, decided November 14, 1994. We are satisfied that the challenged determinations are not so against the great weight and preponderance of the evidence as to be clearly wrong or manifestly unjust. Cain v. Bain, 709 S.W.2d 175, 176 (Tex. 1986); In re King's Estate, 150 Tex. 662, 244 S.W.2d 660 (1951).

	Philip F. O'Ne Appeals Judg
CONCUR:	
Judy L. S. Barnes Appeals Judge	
Robert W. Potts	

Appeals Judge

The decision and order of the hearing officer are affirmed.